Long-term Warren Act Contract Between the United States of America and the City of Roseville

Final

Environmental AssessmentFinding of No Significant Impact

Initial Study Negative Declaration







United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation

Mid-Pacific Region Central California Area Office Folsom, California

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Approval by United States
For
A Long-term Warren Act Contract
For the City of Roseville

Recommended:

CCAO Environmental Specialist

Concur:

Regional Environmental Officer

Approved:

CCAO Area Manager

Date: 9-7-06 FONSI No: CCAO-FONSI-06-1

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION Central California Area Office, California

Approval by United States for Long-term Warren Act Contract For the City of Roseville

Finding of No Significant Impact

Lead Agency:

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region
Central California Area Office
Sacramento, California

This Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the long-term Warren Act contract between the City of Roseville and the United States of America has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, and the Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508). The Central California Area Office of the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) has found that the Proposed Action will not significantly affect the quality of the environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Under the Proposed Action, Reclamation proposes to enter into a long-term (25-year) Warren Act contract with the City to facilitate delivery of up to 30,000 acre-feet annually of Placer County Water Agency Middle Fork Project water through Folsom Reservoir and the federal facilities at Folsom Dam, to the City's Water Treatment Plant for ultimate use in the City's service area.

Under the No-Action alternative, Reclamation would not execute a long-term (25-year) Warren Act contract with the City. However, the City could utilize up to 4,000 AFA of purchased water from San Juan Water District during normal/wet years.

In addition to the Proposed Action and the No-Action alternative, the Downstream Diversion Alternative was fully considered. This alternative would also require a long-term Warren Act contract with Reclamation. However, implementation of this alternative would divert water from the Sacramento River, downstream of its confluence with the American River at the City of Sacramento's Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant.

Additional alternatives were considered but eliminated from further consideration because they failed to meet the screening criteria. These additional alternatives were:

- Purchase of a surface water supply from the State Water Project
- Purchase of an additional surface water supply from the federal Central Valley Project (CVP)
- Purchase of a surface water supply from other agencies with upstream surface or subsurface storage
- Increased surface water storage upstream on the American River.
- Groundwater supply
- Wastewater reclamation
- Water demand reduction/water conservation.

FINDINGS

An Environmental Assessment (EA), distributed for public review in January of 2006, and the attached revisions to that EA have been prepared to disclose potential environmental impacts pursuant to NEPA. The following discussion identifies why any effects of the Proposed Action are not considered significant.

- Reclamation's Proposed Action will have no impacts to aesthetics and agricultural resources because Reclamation is not authorizing any physical changes or construction.
- The Proposed Action alternative will have no significant impacts to air quality because the attainment status would not change as a result of this action.
- 3. Reclamation completed informal consultation and technical assistance with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on the effects of the Proposed Action on the federally listed winter-run Chinook salmon or their critical habitat, spring-run Chinook salmon, and Central Valley steelhead. NMFS concurred with Reclamation that the Proposed Action, as defined for federal ESA consultation purposes, would not adversely affect these listed species (See Appendix N: Consultation Correspondence).
- 4. Reclamation has determined that the Proposed Action will have no effect on the Critical Habitat for spring-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead as defined in January 2006. We base this no effect determination on the fact that any changes to American River flows (and any potential resultant changes to critical habitat) would be well within normal operational parameters/protocols and would not affect constituent elements of critical habitat.
- Evaluation of the hydrologic, water temperature, and salmon mortality modeling outputs over a 70-year period predict that under the Proposed Action potential impacts to operational flexibility to meet downstream fisheries requirements would not be significant.
- 6. Reclamation has determined that the Proposed Action will have no effect on the federally threatened southern distinct population segment of North American green sturgeon (Acipenser medirostris). The no effect determination is based on the following: 1) green sturgeon are not known to occur in the American River, and; 2).

- green sturgeon spawning in the Sacramento River occurs well upstream of the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers, so any changes to American River temperature and flow would have no effect on green sturgeon spawning.
- 7. Reclamation completed informal consultation and technical assistance with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on the effects of the Proposed Action on the federally listed vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*), vernal pool tadpole shrimp (*Ledidurus packardii*), and valley elderberry longhom beetle (*Desocerus californicus dimorphus*). USFWS concurred with Reclamation that the Proposed Action, as defined for federal ESA consultation purposes, would not adversely affect these listed species or designated critical habitat for these species (See Appendix N: Consultation Correspondence).
- The proposed action is an administrative action that has no potential to affect historic
 properties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.3(a)(1).
- As the proposed project is a water contract that utilizes existing water-related
 infrastructure, no new construction activities will be needed to implement the
 proposed project. Therefore no ground disturbance or increase in hazardous waste
 will result from the Proposed Action.
- 10. Under the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action, the State Water Project (SWP) customers would receive identical deliveries therefore no effect to SWP Water Supply and Hydrology.
- 11. Under the Proposed Action, modeling indicates that one year in a 70-year period CVP municipal and industrial (M&I) water customers and agricultural water customers might experience a 5% reduction in water delivery. However, the model imposes some artificial constraints on the CVP systems. Foremost among these model constraints is a required 5% reduction in CVP water deliveries on a monthly basis if the CVP minimum reservoir storage requirements are encroached. In real-time the reduction maybe less than the 5% reduction modeled or this reduction in water deliveries may not be required at all, given operational flexibility on a daily basis to plan the timing of water deliveries. The impacts of the proposed project given that: 1) only one year in 70 might experience a water delivery reduction, and 2) that operational flexibility probably would reduce the impact of that one year to less than a 5% reduction in water delivery, indicate that impacts to CVP Water Supply and Hydrology are less than significant.
- 12. The proposed project would meet existing water demands (in water-short years) and meet the demands of the projected and approved growth disclosed in the Roseville General Plan and Specific Plans. Reclamation's action will have no impacts to land use because our action does not authorize or otherwise control any construction or physical changes.
- 13. No impacts to mineral resources (namely sand and gravel extraction), population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems, are

- anticipated because Reclamation's action does not authorize or otherwise control any construction or physical changes beyond use of conveyance capacity.
- 14. No impacts to noise (namely no increase in noise associated with transportation) or impacts to transportation and traffic are anticipated.
- 15. Evaluation of the hydrologic modeling output for the Proposed Action indicates that impacts to hydropower generation would not be significant. Further, the increase in energy requirement at Folsom Pumping plant is due entirely to the increased diversion for the City. In this case, the beneficiaries of the increased diversion (the City) would be the only party financially responsible for the increased energy requirement.
- 16. The cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action were defined as the water diversions, both planned and fully implemented, within the American River basin. The cumulative impact analysis evaluated whether the Proposed Action would result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on the American River and other related California rivers and reservoirs. The Proposed Action would not significantly contribute to river flow fluctuations and would not significantly decrease the end-of-month water surface elevation of CVP or SWP reservoirs. Therefore the cumulative incremental impacts of the Proposed Action would not have significant impacts on fisheries, cultural resources, water supply and hydrology, recreation, power supply, or water quality.
- 17. No Indian Trust Assets (ITA) have been identified within the project study area. Therefore the Proposed Action has no effect on Indian Trust Assets.
- 18. No disproportionately high or adverse environmental or human health impact on minority or low-income communities have been identified for this Proposed Action. Therefore the Proposed Action has no effect on Environmental Justice.

CONCLUSIONS

Rectamation has fully evaluated the information and analysis contained in the EA as amended for the execution of a long-term Warren Act contract as summarized above. On the basis of these considerations, Reclamation has determined that the EA adequately and accurately addresses the environmental issues and impacts of the Proposed Action and finds that the Proposed Action is not a major federal action that will significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an EIS is not required and will not be prepared for this project, based on the fact that there will be no long-term adverse impacts on the human environment resulting from the execution of a long-term Warren Act contract with the City of Roseville.

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT TITLE: Long-term Warren Act Contract between the City of Receyille and

the United States of America

PROJECT LOCATION: Folsom Reservoir, specifically the urban water supply intake

located within Folsom Dam; the Folsom Pumping Plant and North Fork Pipeline: the City of Specytile Water Treatment Plant, located on Barton Road in the community of Grantie Bay, Please County. CA: the CVP, including the Segremento River and its upstream. receivein (i.e., Sheets and Trinity), Folcom Receiver, the lower American River, and the Delta; and the SWP, including the

Feether River and Oroville Reservoir.

DATE: April 3, 2006

for uttimate use in the City's service area.

PROJECT APPLICANT: City of Proseville Department of Environmental Utilities LEAD AGENCY: City of Roseville Community Development Department

CONTACT PERSON: Dentick Whitehead (915/774-5770): PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation proposes to enter into a longterm (25-year) Warren Act Contract with the City of Resoville to facilitate delivery of up to 30,000 acre-fest annually of Placer County Water Agency Middle Fork Project water through Foleom Reservoir and the (eders) facilities at Foleom Dern, to the City's Water Treatment Plant

DECLARATION

The City of Roseville Emironmental Coordinator has determined that the above project will have no aignificant effect on the environment and is therefore exempt from the requirement of an errylrommental impact report (EIR). The determination is based on the attached initial study and the following findings:

- The project will not degrade environmental quality, substantially reduce habitat, between widthe population to drop indian self-customing invals, reduce the number or maintain the range of special-status species, or electricité important grantplus of Culturals history or prohibitary.
- The project does not have the potential to applies graph-term, to the disaptembage of long-term, emborrounds.
- The project self not have impacts that are inclutionly limited, but curvatethely considerable.
 The project self not have environmental effects that self cause substantial advance effects on human beings, allow directly or inclinally.
- No expectable evidence union that the project will have a regarder or advance effect on the environment.
 The project incorporate of applicable militation resources identified in the affected initial electry.
 This regular declaration reflects the independent just present of the lead agency.

Written Comments shall be received no later than 30 days from the posting date. City Council disturzamention on this Negative Declaration is final.

Submit communic to: Ma. Etrobath Avras U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Central Cultornia Office 7794 Follow Dam Road Follows, CA 95830-1799

Posting Period: 1/27/08-2/27/08

Emérônmental Coordinator

City of Roseville

Environmental Assessment - Finding of No Significant Impact Initial Study - Negative Declaration For a Long-term Warren Act Contract Between the United States of America and the City of Roseville

TABLE OF CONTENTS 1.1. Project Purpose and Objectives1-1 1.2. Purpose of this Environmental Assessment/Initial Study..................1-1 1.3. Scope of this Joint Document as a Biological Assessment1-3. 1.4. Warren Act Contract 1-4 1.5. Proposed Action/Proposed Project......1-5 1.6. Agency and Public Involvement......1-7 1.6.1. Public Review of the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study1-7 1.6.2. Final Environmental Assessment/Initial Study......1-7 2.0 REVISIONS TO THE PUBLIC DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/ INITIAL STUDY......2-1 3.0 PUBLIC REVIEW COMMENTS AND RESPONSES3-1 4.0 REFERENCES......4-1 TABLES Table 2-1. Text revisions to the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study........2-1 APPENDICES

Appendix A: Final Long-term Warren Act Contract

Appendix B: Distribution List for Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

Acronyms

AF acre-feet

AFA acre-feet annually
BA Biological Assessment

CDFG California Department of Fish and Game
CDPR California Department of Parks and Recreation

CEQA California Environmental Quality Act
CESA California Endangered Species Act

City City of Roseville

CORPS U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Cumulative Report American River Basin Cumulative Study Impact Report

CVP Central Valley Project

Delta Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta

EA Environmental Assessment

EFH essential fish habitat

EIR Environmental Impact Report

ESA Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended

FISH Plan Initial Fisheries and In-stream Habitat Management and

Restoration Plan

FONSI Finding of No Significant Impact

HME Lower American River Habitat Management Element

IS Initial Study

MFP Middle Fork Project
msl mean sea level
ND Negative Declaration

NEPA National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

NMFS National Marine Fisheries Service PCWA Placer County Water Agency Reclamation U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

SWP State Water Project

SWRCB State Water Resources Control Board

USFWS U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

WTP Water Treatment Plant

Chapter 1 Introduction

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) proposes to enter into a long-term (25-year) Warren Act contract with the City of Roseville (City). This contract is for the conveyance of up to 30,000 acre-feet annually (AFA) of Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) Middle Fork Project (MFP) water through Folsom Reservoir and the federal facilities at Folsom Dam to the City's Water Treatment Plant (WTP) for ultimate use in the City service area.

1.1. PROJECT PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of executing a long-term Warren Act contract with the City is to allow for conveyance of up to 30,000 AFA of water rights water (purchased from PCWA) to the City's WTP for ultimate use in its retail service area. As such, this Environmental Assessment/Initial Study (EA/IS) includes analysis of the secondary effects of growth facilitated by the delivery of water rights water within the City's water service area. The City's service area is within PCWA's authorized place of use and constitutes efficient inbasin utilization of PCWA's water rights water by the City. A new long-term Warren Act contract would provide the City with the operational flexibility to better meet its existing and future water demands through a combination of Central Valley Project (CVP) and non-CVP water supply deliveries. Under a new long-term Warren Act contract, the City would be able to exercise both its federal CVP contract water, as well as its purchased PCWA water rights water, under a wider range of water availability conditions. In watershort years for example, where deficiencies would be imposed upon the CVP supplies, the City would be able to rely on its PCWA water supply to meet its needs. This ability to access its water rights entitlement to meet water demands beyond their CVP water supply is critical to the City, as it continues to progress towards buildout and as water availability throughout the CVP becomes increasingly limited.

1.2. Purpose of this Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

The purpose of this document is threefold. First, it meets Reclamation's impact assessment obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). NEPA requires full disclosure regarding potential federal actions, their alternatives, potential impacts, and possible mitigation for actions taken by federal agencies.

Second, it satisfies the City's environmental review obligations under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Cal. Pub. Resources Code §21000 et seq.) and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Cal. Fish and Game Code §2050 et seq.) as they act to enter into the proposed Warren Act contract with Reclamation. CEQA requires consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), as a trustee agency, for projects that might affect the habitat of a state threatened or endangered species. This joint document serves as the required CEQA document and includes information related to sensitive state species that are intended to support the appropriate consultations with CDFG.

CEQA mandates that projects which are consistent with the development density. established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183). The proposed City of Roseville long-term Warren Act contract is designed to meet both the City's existing and future planned water needs within the context of an approved General Plan. Impacts on resources, activities, services, and the quality of life within the City's service area have already been addressed in the environmental review and approval processes associated with the General Plan and, moreover, have been evaluated in several individual specific plans. The previous environmental documents associated with these plans identified and addressed significant unavoidable effects associated with full buildout of the City. No new significant environmental effects peculiar to the proposed long-term Warren Act contract would occur within the City's service area that have not already been disclosed. in previous environmental documents approved and certified by the City. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, an EIR is not required to address potential impacts within the City's service area as a direct result of the proposed longterm Warren Act contract.

Third, it provides documentation for Reclamation's obligations and requirements under the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA) (16 U.S.C. §§1531 et seq.) with respect to the action that Reclamation proposes to take (i.e., execution of a Warren Act contract and the delivery of water through the federal facilities at Folsom Dam and Reservoir pursuant thereto).

This joint document, therefore, serves as the appropriate environmental review and approval document under both NEPA and CEQA. Under this joint document, an EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) are included in compliance with NEPA, and an IS and Negative Declaration (ND) are included in compliance with CEQA. Reclamation is the designated lead agency under NEPA and the City of Roseville is the designated lead agency under CEQA. Reclamation and the City published public notices and provided for public and agency review of the Draft EA/IS, as well as the draft FONSI and ND, as described in Section 1.6, Agency and Public Involvement. Reclamation and the City also responded to substantive comments on this joint document, as required by NEPA and CEQA. All public and agency comments on the Draft EA/IS and associated responses are provided in Chapter 2.

With respect to Reclamation's obligations under the federal ESA, this joint document also serves as the Biological Assessment (BA), which must be prepared by Reclamation pursuant to section 7(c) of the federal ESA (16 U.S.C. §1536(c)) and to 50 C.F.R. Part 402. The potential effects of Reclamation's Proposed Action on federally listed threatened and endangered species and on species proposed for federal listing must be evaluated within the context of the federal ESA. Reclamation and the City have been involved in coordination and informal consultations regarding the Proposed Action with both the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) since 2000. As a result of these efforts, NMFS has provided

Reclamation with a Letter of Concurrence (dated December 13, 2002) that the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley spring-run salmon, or Central Valley steelhead, or designated critical habitat (see Appendix N of the Draft EA/FONSI – IS/ND, January 2006). Additionally, NMFS indicated that the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect essential fish habitat (EFH) for Pacific salmon. (Please refer to Chapter 6 Endangered Species Act Compliance, of the Draft EA/IS, January 2006, for additional discussion regarding NMFS consultation history). As part of the administrative record, Reclamation provided a copy of the Draft EA/IS to NMFS, which includes the BA.

Similar to their involvement with NMFS, Reclamation and the City have coordinated with USFWS regarding ESA requirements and agreements for the Proposed Action. Reclamation provided USFWS with a review copy of the Draft EA/IS, which includes the BA. Following USFWS review of this joint document, USFWS provided Reclamation with a Letter of Concurrence (dated January 19, 2006), which included the determination that the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect the federally listed vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, valley elderberry longhom beetle, or designated critical habitat (see Appendix N of the Draft EA/IS, January 2006). (Please refer to Chapter 6, Endangered Species Act Compliance, of the Draft EA/IS, January 2006, for additional discussion regarding USFWS consultation history).

1.3. Scope of this Joint Document as a Biological Assessment

The BA analysis addresses whether the Proposed Action may affect any federally listed threatened or endangered species, candidate species, or any species proposed for listing under the ESA that is known or likely to occur within the action area. The action area includes all areas where direct or indirect effects of the Proposed Action may occur. Because the Proposed Action involves Reclamation's operation of CVP facilities for water supply, the Department of Water Resource's operation of the State Water Project (SWP) in response to water deliveries related to the proposed diversion, and other environmental or regulatory obligations, the regional study area encompasses the reservoirs and water courses of the CVP and SWP, north of and including the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Detta (Detta), as well as all lands within the City's service area where the water may be distributed.

This BA addresses the following major issues for aquatic and terrestrial species within the action area:

- The presence of suitable habitat or potential suitable habitat for each proposed or listed species in the area affected by the Proposed Action (i.e., execution of a Warren Act contract);
- The established level of use or potential for use of the suitable habitat for each proposed or listed species in the area affected by the Proposed Action;
- The presence, and estimated magnitude, of potential disturbances to proposed or listed species or habitat as a result of the Proposed Action;
- The extent of direct habitat loss due to the Proposed Action:
- The overall level of direct and indirect effects of the Proposed Action on proposed and listed species; and

 The past measures implemented to mitigate for indirect effects on proposed and fisted species and their habitat.

Reclamation, with cooperation from USFWS and NMFS, previously developed a strategy to address the cumulative effects of the multiple water diversion actions proposed for the American River Basin. These diversion actions include the water to be delivered to the City under its proposed Warren Act contract with Reclamation. A specific analysis prepared by Reclamation as contained in the American River Basin Cumulative Study Impact Report (Cumulative Report) (August 2002) is incorporated by reference as it represents the definitive (and most recent) evaluation of the potential future cumulative impacts to the American River Basin. The Cumulative Report is incorporated by reference in its entirety and made a part of this joint environmental document for the Proposed Action/Proposed Project. Accordingly, the hydrologic modeling relied upon for the cumulative analysis of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project is consistent with the Cumulative Report.

1.4. WARREN ACT CONTRACT

The Warren Act (43 U.S.C. §523) of 1911 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to enter into Warren Act contracts with water purveyors to carry non-Project water (i.e., water not part of the CVP) through federal facilities. Under section 305 of the States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991 (43 U.S.C. §2211 et seq.), "Excess Storage and Carrying Capacity," the Secretary is authorized to execute contracts with municipalities, public water districts and agencies, other federal agencies, state agencies, and private entities pursuant to the Warren Act. These contracts provide for the impounding, storage, and conveyance of non-Project water for domestic, municipal, fish and wildlife, industrial, and other beneficial uses using any CVP facilities identified in the law, including Folsom Dam and Reservoir.

In the past, PCWA has supplied the City with water in years with CVP shortages, or, more recently, when the City has projected using its full allocation of CVP water and needed additional water to meet its existing demands. In order to convey PCWA MFP water through the federal facilities at Folsom Dam, the City and Reclamation have entered into several one-year temporary "wheeling" contracts. The most recent of these one-year contracts expired on February 28, 2005. A one-year Warren Act contract was not requested for the March 2005 through February 2006 period due to above average precipitation during the spring of 2005. However, existing and future water demands within the City service area will continue to require the use of PCWA water supplies and the need to secure a long-term "wheeling" agreement from Reclamation.

A draft Warren Act contract has been prepared by Reclamation and is included in Appendix M of the Draft EA/IS, January 2006. This draft contract includes the following key provisions:

- Term of the contract extends from contract execution through February 28, 2031.
- Non-Project water available to the City is represented by the quantities set forth under an agreement between the City and PCWA (dated May 17, 1989, as

- amended), which includes a water supply of up to 30,000 AFA from PCWA's upstream MFP reservoirs.
- Point-of-delivery of non-Project water to the City is the Hinkle "Y."
- 4. Responsibility for requiring PCWA to make releases from PCWA's upstream reservoirs during July, August, September, and October, as well as any other month where it is deemed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) that PCWA has no right to divert the natural flow of the American River, rests with the City.
- PCWA's releases should include an additional five percent to account for transportation losses.
- Non-Project water introduced in Folsom Reservoir by the City and remaining there for 30 days or more shall be deemed unused water, available to the United States for Project purposes.
- Responsibility for the supply and payment of all electrical power and associated transmission service charges to pump non-Project water through the federal facilities at Folsom Reservoir rests with the City.
- Non-Project water conveyed to the City shall be measured and recorded with
 equipment furnished, installed, operated, and maintained by the City, and the
 accuracy of such equipment shall be subject to inspection by the United States.
- Non-project water made available to the City shall be utilized in accordance with all
 applicable requirements of any Biological Opinion addressing the long-term renewal
 of the City's CVP water service contract.

The draft Warren Act contract was published for a 60-day public review period on January 10, 2006. The final long-term Warren Act contract is included as Appendix A of this Final EA/IS.

1.5. PROPOSED ACTION/PROPOSED PROJECT

The Proposed Action/Proposed Project initiating preparation of this joint environmental document consists of Reclamation entering into a long-term (25-year) Warren Act contract with the City of Roseville to convey up to 30,000 AFA of non-Project water (i.e., water not part of the CVP) through the federal facilities at Folsom Dam (e.g., Folsom Pumping Plant). This long-term contract would permit City use of the CVP facilities to convey water from the PCWA MFP to the City's WTP for ultimate delivery to the City's service area. For purposes of this joint environmental document, the Proposed Action under NEPA is synonymous with the Proposed Project under CEQA.

Diversion of the City's non-Project water supply as purchased PCWA water rights water would occur at the urban water supply intake at Folsom Dam. Water delivered through the urban water supply intake is conveyed to the Folsom Pumping Plant at the base of the dam. Of the two pipelines that convey water from the pumping plant to users both north and south of the American River, the 84-inch North Fork Pipeline delivers water to the City. The North Fork Pipeline, after leaving the Folsom Pumping Plant, spllts at a junction point approximately 700 feet south of the San Juan Water District's Hinkle Reservoir know as the Hinkle "Y." Of the two branches that split from the Hinkle "Y." the

western branch continues in a northwesterly direction for about 9,000 feet through a 48-inch pipeline to the City WTP. A second parallel 60-inch raw water transmission line from Reclamation facilities and the City's WTP was recently constructed. Combined, these raw water transmission lines are capable of conveying a peak flow of 97 mgd (150 cfs) for treatment at the City's WTP.

The Proposed Project/Proposed Action includes the City's participation in the Water Forum Agreement and financial contribution to the Lower American River Habitat Management Element (HME). The Lower American River HME was developed as part of the Water Forum Agreement to provide mitigation for both river habitat and recreation effects of Water Forum purveyor actions, including the City's long-term Warren Act contract. The lower American River HME includes detailed descriptions of all reasonable and feasible projects that could be implemented to avoid and/or offset potential impacts to lower American River fishery and riparian resources as a result of Water Forum actions, including the Proposed Action/Proposed Project.

As part of the lower American River HME, the Initial Fisheries and In-stream Habitat Management and Restoration Plan (FISH Plan) was developed in 2001, and serves as the aquatic Habitat Management Plan for the lower American River, as required by the Water Forum Agreement. The FISH Plan constitutes a single blueprint of management and restoration actions for enhancement of lower American River fisheries and instream habitat. Management and restoration actions presented in the FISH Plan for improvement of water temperature within the lower American River include developing and implementing a basin-wide temperature modeling program; evaluating the effectiveness of coldwater pool management at Folsom Dam and Reservoir through a variety of methods; constructing and operating a temperature control device for El Dorado Irrigation District; accessing coldwater between the lower river outlet works and the penstocks to address the needs of priority lower American River fish species; and improving efficiency of water transport through Lake Natoma (e.g., modifying channel in Lake Natoma).

As part of its Purveyor Specific Agreement with the Water Forum, the City is committed to an annual payment of \$3.00 per acre-foot of non-CVP water used above its 1995 baseline water demand to the Water Forum HME. The City's Purveyor Specific Agreement with the Water Forum also includes a requirement that Roseville enter into an agreement with PCWA for replacing up to 20,000 AF of water to the River from reoperation of PCWA's MFP reservoirs. This reoperation water is included as part of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project (see Appendix I, Modeling Technical Memorandum, of the Draft EA/IS for detailed information).

Under its Purveyor Specific Agreement with the Water Forum, the City also will participate in financial contribution to the Folsom Reservoir Recreation Program. The City has agreed to work with their elected officials, the California Department of Park and Recreation (CDPR), and other agencies that have an interest in reservoir levels, to obtain at least \$3,000,000 of new funding for improvements to Folsom Reservoir recreation facilities (Water Forum Agreement, 2000). If less than \$3,000,000 of the new funds is not secured by the year 2008, the City will provide a lump sum payment of up to \$1,000,000 of the shortfall to CDPR for projects to improve Folsom Reservoir

recreation no later than June 30, 2009. This is to provide certainty that funding necessary for Folsom Reservoir recreation mitigation will be secured and some of the proposed projects for mitigation can be implemented by the CDPR (Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Water Forum Proposal, 1999). The City has agreed to enter into a contract to commit themselves to sharing the cost of providing this funding. Costs will be apportioned based upon the signatory agencies anticipated share of the 2030 increased diversions of American River water.

1.6. AGENCY AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Reclamation, as the lead agency under NEPA, is responsible for ensuring compliance with NEPA environmental documentation and process requirements for the Proposed Action. The City of Roseville, as the lead agency under CEQA and party to the long-term Warren Act contract, is responsible for ensuring compliance with CEQA environmental documentation and process requirements for the Proposed Project. Reclamation and the City have been active participants in the preparation of the environmental documentation and in the public involvement activities associated with the Proposed Action/Proposed Project.

In accordance with NEPA and CEQA, preparation of the EA/IS included contacts with affected agencies, organizations and persons who may have an interest in the Proposed Action/Proposed Project. Specific agencies that were contacted during preparation and public circulation of the Draft EA/IS included:

- Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- California Department of Parks and Recreation
- National Marine Fisheries Service.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- California Department of Fish and Game
- State Historic Preservation Officer.

1.6.1. Public Review of the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

Reclamation and the City distributed the Draft EA/IS, as well as the Draft FONSI and ND, to federal and state resource and regulatory agencies, legislative representatives, water districts, environmental organizations, and other interested parties on January 27, 2006. The Distribution List for the Draft EA/IS is included as Appendix 8 of this Final EA/IS. In accordance with Reclamation's NEPA policy and the CEQA statutes, the Draft EA/IS was available for public and agency review and comment for a 30-day period, which closed on February 27, 2006.

1.6.2. Final Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

This Final EA/IS has been prepared through consideration and in response to substantive comments received from public and agency review on the Draft EA/IS. The following agencies provided comment letters on the Draft EA/IS:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- California Department of Parks and Recreation
- California State Clearinghouse

The Draft EA/IS (January 2006) is incorporated by reference in its entirety and made a part of this Final EA/IS for the Proposed Action/Proposed Project. The Final EA/IS also includes the responses to public and agency review comments, and clarifications or further explanations of information provided in the Draft EA/IS. The comment letters and associated responses to comments are provided in Chapter 2 of this Final EA/IS. Clarifications and/or further explanations of information contained within the Draft EA/IS are provided in Chapter 3 of this Final EA/IS.

The responses to comments provided in Chapter 2 provide additional detail regarding the Proposed Action/Proposed Project and clarify technical impact discussions. The additional information provided in response to public and agency comments received during the public review and comment period, including updated information or additional analyses performed as part of the response to comments, do not alter the impact conclusions presented in the Draft EA/IS. In addition, no revisions or corrections to the text of the EA/IS were identified in response to comments received on the Draft EA/IS. Some text revisions however, were incorporated to acknowledge items inadvertently omitted from a particular section of the document, provide additional clarification regarding Proposed Action/Proposed Project elements and/or analyses, incorporate additional details regarding Proposed Action/Proposed Project features or mitigation measures, and correct other minor errors found during public review and preparation of the Final EA/IS. These revisions are further described in Chapter 2.

Based upon this process and associated analysis, Reclamation, through the FONSI, is responsible for determining that the EA is adequate and in compliance with NEPA. The City, through the ND, is responsible for determining that the IS is adequate and in compliance with CEQA. After making these determinations, Reclamation will use the EA/FONSI and the City will use the IS/ND in making its decision on whether to approve the Proposed Action/Proposed Project.

Chapter 2 Revisions to the Public Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

This chapter identifies all changes to the text of the Public Draft EA/IS. The following revisions to the Draft EA/IS are one component of the materials that comprise this Final EA/IS, which has been prepared following the close of the Draft EA/IS public review period in February 2006. The Final EA/IS contains clarifications and/or further explanations of information provided in the Draft EA/IS as described below, as well as the comments received on the Draft EA/IS and associated responses contained within Chapter 2 of this Final EA/IS.

Table 2-1 identifies specific modifications and corrections to the Draft EA/IS. Changes to the Draft EA/IS presented below are intended to acknowledge items inadvertently omitted from a particular section of the document, provide additional clarification regarding Proposed Action/Proposed Project elements and/or analyses, incorporate additional details regarding Proposed Action/Proposed Project features or mitigation measures, and correct other minor errors found during public review and preparation of the Final EA/IS. Changes in text are signified by strikeouts where text is removed and by underlining text that is added. The changes to the document do not alter the impact conclusions that were presented in the Draft EA/IS.

Table 2-1.	Text revisions to the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study.				
Page No.	Updated Text				
Famous or	No Signation of Bracks				
3	Cultural Resources				
	 Cultural resources within the Proposed Action's Area of Potential Effect (APE) would not become more likely to be exposed along rivers or within reservoir drawdown areas of the project or regional study area due to the Proposed Action, relative to the No Action Alternative. 				
	 The Proposed Action does not involve construction or earthwork activities that could lead to potential disturbance of buried cultural resources. 				
	 Further, the City of Receville will econdinate with the State of California's Historia Procervation Officer-and the U.S. Advisory Council on Historia Preservation to ensure compliance with Section 106 of the National Historia Procervation Act. 				
CHAPTERS.	Carried Conference Conference of the Conference				
3-11	Trinity Reservoir				
	The Upper Trinity Wintu Indians inhabited the valley below Trinity Reservoir prior to the construction of Trinity Dam. Prehistoric evidence dates back 2,000 to 3,000 years, although the area was probably inhabited even before that time. Archaeological surveys during the 1950s documented very large village sites that are believed to have been inhabited year-round. These sites were declarated damaged when the valley was flooded after construction of the dam. As at Shasta Reservoir, many known prehistoric sites at Trinity Reservoir are subject to ongoing damage as a result of fluctuating water levels, which exposes them to wind and wave action, and as a result of looting.				

	ext revisions to the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study.				
Page No.	Updated Text				
3-32	The predominant recreational activities at Folsom Reservoir are water-dependent uses, such as boating, water-skiring, personal watercraft use, swimming, and fishing. Five boat ramps are available at Folsom Reservoir. Reclamation attempts to maintain storage in Folsom Reservoir throughout the summer at sufficient fevels to accommodate access to as many boat ramps and marine facilities as possible. The upper (easternmost) arms of the lake are designated as slow zones for quiet cruising, fishing, and nature appreciation. Folsom Reservoir also is an important source of scenic, and natural, and cultural resources for water-enhanced recreational activities. Water-enhanced activities provided at the reservoir include camping, trail use, pionicking, and nature study.				
CHAPTER 5					
5-11	Steelhead potentially could be affected by riparian habitat loss and decreased water quality, which typically accompany development activities. Dry Creek has been designated as critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead (70 FR 170) and afterations in riparian and instream habitat used for spawning and rearing could adversely affect this species. In addition, degraded water quality in City streams and creeks resulting from urban runoff also could be detrimental to steelhead.				
5-21	Several species within the regional study area are of primary management concern either as a result of their declining status or their importance to recreational and/or commercial fisheries. The species selected for species-specific assessments include those sensitive to changes in both river flows and water temperature throughout the year, as well as habitat conditions within the Delta. Therefore, an evaluation of effects on winter-run, spring-run, and fall-run/late fall-run Chinook salmon, steethead, delta smelt, American shad, and striped basis is believed to reasonably encompass the range of potential effects that could occur on other fish resources, including green sturgeon. Given the cimilarities between riverine conditions custable for adult groon cturgeon migration and operating and juvenile green sturgeon reasing and those of Chinook salmon, and a general tack of definitive information on green sturgeon life history requirements in Control Valley rivers, assessing imposts on Chinook salmon are anticipated to provide a reasonable estimate of petential imposts on green sturgeon. CDFG (2002) suggests that the Southern DPS green sturgeon spawn and rear for the first two months between Keswick Dam (RM 302) and Hamilton City. In addition, green and white sturgeon occasionally enter the Feather River system, but intensive sampling in recent years has found no evidence of spawning and there is no data that spawning occurs now or occurred in the historical time frame (Beamesderfer et al. 2004). No current use by sturgeon of Sacramento River tributaries, other than the Feather River system, has been reported (Beamesderfer et al. 2004, Moyle 2002). Michael Nepstad (Reclamation, personal communication, May 8, 2006) has stated that "Reclamation has determined that the Proposed Action will have no effect on the federally threatened southern distinct population segment of North American green sturgeon (Acipenser medinasins). We base this no effect determination on the following: 1) green sturgeon in the Sacramento Ri				
5-30	Flow- and water temperature-related impacts on the lower American River are discussed separately below by species and life stage. A number of fish species of primary management concern utilize the lower American River during one or more of their life stages, and seasonal changes in releases from Folsom Reservoir resulting from implementation of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project could affect flows and water temperatures in the lower American River during portions of the year. For these reasons, species specific effects assessments are warranted for the lower American River and are conducted for fall-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, American shad, and striped bass. These species are of primary management concern due either to the importance of their				

Table 2-1. Text revisions to the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study.						
Page No.	Updated Text					
	commercial and/or recreational fisheries (i.e., Chinook salmon, steelhead, American shad and striped bass) and/or because they are species currently listed under the federat ESA (i.e., steethead). Because the species selected for species-specific assessments include those sensitive to changes in both river flow and water temperature throughout the year, an evaluation of impacts to these species is believed to reasonably encompass the range of potential impacts to lower American River fish resources that could occur under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project. Organizationally, flow- and water temperature-related impacts to fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead are discussed concurrently, followed by impact discussions for American shad and striped bass.					
	Populations of spring-run Chinogk salmon were previously assumed to be restricted to accessible reaches in the upper Sacramento River mainstem, Antelope Creek, Battle Creek, Beegum Creek, Big Chico Creek, Butte Creek, Clear Creek, Deer Creek, Feather River, Mill Creek, and the Yuba River (CALFED 2000; CDFG 1998; NMFS 2002a; NMFS 2003). However, spring-run Chinook salmon juvenites have been observed rearing in non natal tributaries and intermittent streams during winter months (NMFS 2004), and the lower 10 miles of the American River has been designated as critical habitat for spring-run Chinook salmon (see Section 6.5.1.4 for further information). Critical habitat considerations for spring-run Chinook salmon are addressed in the analysis for fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead in the lower American River.					
5-39 to 5-	Since completion of Shesta Dam, the Sacramento River, Battle Creek, and Calaveras River are the only habitats where winter-rup Chinook have been known to occur (NMES 1999; USFWS 1987). The only known spawning population for green sturgeon in California occurs in the Sacramento and Ktamath rivers. (Moyle 2002, NMES 2002). Therefore, winter-rup Chinook salmon and green sturgeon are not included in the species-specific assessments for the lower American River. Summary of Potential Impacts on Fell-run Chinook Salmon and Steelhead in the Lower					
40	In summary, potential changes in flow in the lower American River under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project during September through March would not be of sufficient frequency and magnitude to adversely affect adult fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead homing or immigration. Similarly, fluctuations in flows under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project during October through February would not be of sufficient frequency and magnitude to adversely affect fall-run Chinook salmon or the water quantity and quality conditions and substrate supporting steelhead spawning and egg incubation. Changes in flow that would occur under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project during the March through June period would not be of sufficient frequency and magnitude to adversely affect juvenile fall-run Chinook salmon or steelhead rearing. Similarly, changes in flow that would occur under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project during the February through June period would not be of sufficient frequency and magnitude to adversely affect juvenile fall-run Chinook salmon or freshwater migration comidgrs for steethead emigration Lastly, potential changes in flow in the lower American River under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project during July through February would not be of sufficient frequency and magnitude to adversely affect rearing sites with water quantity and floodplain connectivity to form and maintain physical habitat conditions and support juvenile growth and mobility; water quality and forace supporting juvenile development; and natural cover for steelhead rearing.					
	Changes in water temperature in the lower American River under Proposed Action/Proposed Project during September through March would not be of sufficient frequency and magnitude to adversely affect adult fall-run Chinook salmon and steelhead homing or immigration. Similarly, changes in water temperature under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project during October through February would not be of sufficient					

	Text revisions to the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study.				
Page No.	Updated Text				
	frequency and magnitude to adversely affect fall-run Chinook salmon or the water quantity and quality conditions and substrate supporting steelhead spawning and egg incubation. Changes in water temperature that would occur under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project during the March through June period would not be of sufficient frequency and magnitude to adversely affect juvenile fall-run Chinook salmon or steelhead rearing. Similarly, potential changes in water temperature that would occur under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project during the February through June period would not be of sufficient frequency and magnitude to adversely affect juvenile fall-run Chinook salmon or freshwater migration corridors for steelhead emigration. Lastly, potential changes in water temperature in the lower American River under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project during July through February would not be of sufficient frequency and magnitude to adversely affect rearing sites with water quantify and floodplain connectivity to form and				
	maintain physical habitat conditions and support juvenile growth and mobility; water quality				
	and forage supporting juvenile development; and natural cover for steelhead rearing.				
5-66	5.5 Cultural Resources				
Chartin	Criteria for defining significant sultural resources are stipulated in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and CSCA. The NHPA defines a significant cultural property as one which is eligible for fisting on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Eligible properties are those which "(a) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or (b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or (c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or (d) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history" (36 CFR 60.4). 36 CFR Part 800 regulations implement the NHPA.				
6-13	CRITICAL HABITAT DESIGNATION				
	On February 16, 2000, NMFS designated critical habitat for the Central Valley ESU of steelhead (65 FR 7779). NMFS designated that critical habitat to include: 1) all river reaches accessible to listed steelhead in the Sacramento River and its tributaries in California; 2) all river reaches and estuarine areas of the Delta; 3) all waters from Chipps Island westward to Carquinez Bridge, including Honker Bay, Grizzly Bay, Suisun Bay, and Carquinez Strall; 4) all waters of San Pablo Bay westward of the Carquinez Bridge; and 5) all waters of San Francisco Bay (north of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge) from San Pablo Bay to the Golden Gate Bridge (65 FR 7779).				
	On April 30, 2002, under a Consent Decree, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia vacated NMFS' designation of critical habitat for the Central Valley ESU of steelhead (Consent Decree, Net1 Assn. Of Home Builders et al. v. Evans, (D.D.C. Case No. 1:00-CV-02799 (CKK), dated April 30, 2002). On November 30, 2004, NMFS filed proposed rules with the Federal Register to designate critical habitat areas in Washington Oregon, Idaho, and California for 20 species of salmon and steelhead listed as threatened and endangered under the ESA, including the Central Valley ESU of steelhead. The proposed rules include analyses of the economic and other impacts of such designations, and a range of areas that are being considered for exclusion in the final rules. Public hearings were field in January 2005 to receive comments and feedback on the proposal. Fellowing the public comment period and hearings, the final rules are scheduled to be completed by NMFS by June 2005 (NMFS-2004b). Following an extension of the public comment period dosed in March 2005. The final rule for designation of critical habitat for seven ESUs of pacific salmon and steelhead, including Central Valley steelhead, was released on September 2, 2005 (70 FR 170). NMFS designated critical habitat within the action area.				

Page No.	Text revisions to the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study. Updated Text				
	includes: 1) all river reaches accessible to listed steelhead in the Sacramento River and it tributaries in California; 2) all river reaches and estuanne areas of the Detta; 3) American River upstream to endpoints in Dry Creek, Minor's Ravine, and Natomas East Main Canal; and 4) Feather River upstream to endpoints in the Feather River (70 FR 170).				
	In determining what areas are critical habitat, agency regulations at S0 CFR 424.12(b) require that NMFS must "consider those physical or biological features that are essential to the conservation of a given species" The regulations further direct NMFS to "focus on the principal biological or physical constituent elements that are essential to the conservation of the species," and specify that the "known primary constituent elements (PCEs) shall be listed with the critical habitat description." NMFS biologists developed a list of PCEs that are essential to the species conservation and are based on the unique life history of salmon and steethead and their biological needs. The specific PCEs include 1) Freshwater spawning sites with water quantity and quality conditions and substrate supporting spawning, incubation and larval development. These features are essential to conservation because without them the species cannot successfully spawn and produce offspring; 2) Freshwater rearing sites with water quantity and floodolain connectivity to form and maintain physical habitat conditions and support juvenite growth and mobility; water quality and floodolain connectivity to form and maintain physical habitat conditions and support juvenite growth and mobility; water quality and floodolain connectivity to form and maintain physical habitat conditions and support juvenite growth and mobility; water guality and cover such as shade, submerged and overhanging large wood, log jams and beaver dams, aguatic vegetation, large rocks and boulders, side channets, and undercut banks. These features are essential to conservation because without them juveniles cannot access and use the areas needed to forage, grow, and develop behaviors (e.g., predator avoidance, competition) that help ensure their survival; and 3) Freshwater migration comidors free of obstruction with water quantity and quality conditions and adult mobility and survival. These features are essential to conservation because without them juveniles cannot use				
6-15 ta 6- 16	Critical Habitat Designation On February 16, 2000, NMFS designated critical habitat for the Central Valley ESU of spring-run Chinook salmon (65 FR 7778). NMFS designated critical habitat to include: 1) all river reaches accessible to listed Chinook salmon in the Sacramento River and its tributaries; 2) all river reaches and estuarine areas of the Delta; 3) all waters from Chipps Island westward to Carquinez Bridge, including Honker Bay, Grizzly Bay, Suisun Bay, and Carquinez Strait; 4) all waters of San Pablo Bay westward of the Carquinez Bridge; and 5) all waters of San Francisco Bay (north of the San Francisco-Dakland Bay Bridge) from San Pablo Bay to the Golden Gate Bridge (65 FR 7778). On April 30, 2002, under a consent degree, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia vacated NMFS' designation of critical habitat for the Central Valley ESU of spring-run Chinook salmon (Consent Degree, Nat7 Assn. Of Home Builders et al. v. Evens, (D.D.C. Case No. 1:00-CV-02799 (CKK), dated April 30, 2002).				
	On November 30, 2004, NMFS proposed new critical habitat designations for seven ESUs of Pacific salmon and steelhead in California, including the California Central Valley steelhead ESU. Within the action area, proposed critical habitat for Central Valley steelhead includes the lower American River and Dry Crook, extending from the headwaters to the confluence with the Secremente River was the Natemas-East Main				

Page No.	Updated Text
	Drainage Const. Unlike the February 2000 designations that included "alt accessible rive reaches within the current range of the listed species," the November 2004 proposal identifies stream reaches where tisted calmon and steelhood have actually been observe or where biologists with local area expertise procume them to occur. Therefore, certain areas providually identified in 2000 are being considered for exclusion in the final rules. Following an extension of the public comment period on the proposed critical habitat designations, the public comment period closed in March 2005. NMFS is expected to issue final critical habitat designations for Control Valley steelhead in September 2005. The final rule for designation of critical habitat for seven ESUs of pacific salmon and steelhead, including Central Valley spring run Chinook salmon, was released on September 2, 2005 (70 FR 170). NMFS designated critical habitat within the action area includes: 1) all river reaches accessible to listed salmon in the Sacramento River and its tributaries in California; 2) all river reaches and estuarine areas of the Delta; 4) American River upstream to endpoints in the Feather River (70 FR 170).
6-17	6.5.1.5 Green Sturgeon
	LISTING STATUS
	On April 5, 2005, NMFS filed a proposed rule to list the southern population of North American green sturgeon as threatened under the ESA. The southern population of North American green sturgeon is proposed for listing as threatened effective July 6, 2006. This species has no listing status under the California ESA. Because there is limited reported information about green sturgeon available, particularly with respect to species utilization of the lower American River, a broader scope of information is presented below.
6-29	6.7.2 City Service Area
	None of the Listed, proposed listed, candidate, or EFH-managed species within the City service area have the potential to be adversely affected, either directly or indirectly through riparian habitat loss and decreased water quality, by the Proposed Action. The City and NMFS have engaged in dialogue regarding the development of a programmatic review at evaluation of fisheries resources within the City's service area. This dialogue is memorialized in a MA between the City and NMFS dated July 23, 2003. The MA identifies City monitoring tasks that are currently being undertaken to evaluate the effects of urbanization on fisheries habitat. It also outlines thresholds for adaptive management as well as appropriate adaptive management response. The MA also outlines a programmatic approach to consultation that includes a City commitment to engage in watershed planning efforts, including implementation of the City of Roseville Creek and Riparian Management and Restoration Plan. Implementation of this plan, which was prepared in consultation with NMFS, will provide additional management oversight and long-term direction in the protection of anadromous species within the City service area.
	Vernal pool invertebrate species (i.e., vernal pool fairy shrimp and vernal pool tadpole shrimp) do, however, also show the potential to have their potential habitats reduced, as approved development within the City continues. The MOU between the City and USPW outlines the specific processes intended to provide the long-term protection necessary for vernal pool species. Specifically, the MOU identified, at the time of its signing, the commitment of the City to address the needs of vernal pool species occupying vernal pool habitats within the plan area within the context of an HCP or equivalent (see Section 8.3 the MOU). Since the MOU was signed, the City and USFWS have agreed not to pursue an HCP for remaining developing properties within the City but, rather, address species protections for remaining buildout on a project-by-project basis. Additionally, as part of the guidance for the City's interim conservation strategy, the MOU also identified several milestones with which it committed the City to pursue regarding the management of its

	Text revisions to the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study.					
Page No.	Updated Text					
	including City permitted, vernal pool resources within the plan area (see Section 7.3b, of					
	the MOU). See Appendix K for the 30-day deliverables (four maps) agreed to by the City					
	under the MOU. The City also was requested to develop individual operations and					
	maintenance plans for each vernal pool preserve established through the interim					
	conservation strategy and for certain existing vernal pool preserves established by prior					
	agreement between the City and USFWS. Using this approach, existing and future					
	pool preserves would be managed consistent with the larger sub-regional City of Rosevill					
	HCP or equivalent and regional county-wide HCP/NCCP being pursued by Placer County					
	Previous discussions of the City's commitments in meeting the requirements set out by the					
	MOU have been provided in Section 5.4.1.1 (see also Appendix J, City of					
	Roseville/USFWS MOU and related correspondence).					
WERT						
-14	7.1.2.2. Cultural Resources					
-14	1.1.2.2. Cuntoral Nesources					
	EFFECTS OF CHANGES IN WATER SURFACE ELEVATION AT SHASTA RESERVOIR					
	Markette and define and the state of the sta					
	Under the cumulative condition, the minimum water surface elevation at Shasta Reservoir					
	would be from 8 to 45 feet msl lower throughout each month of the year, relative to the					
	existing condition. The Proposed Action/Proposed Project would contribute up to 5 ft msl					
	to the decreases in the minimum long-term average end-of-month elevation at Shasta					
	Reservoir that could occur under the cumulative condition. With implementation of the					
	Proposed Action/Proposed Project, there also would be increases of up to 1 ft mst in the					
	minimum long-term average end-of-month elevation at Shasta Reservoir (Appendix G,					
	Cultural Reservoirs, Shasta). To reduce the petential for significant adverse effects on					
	cultural resources at Shasta Reservoir due to the increased potential for the reserver					
	elevation to fall below normal minimal and of-month elevations due to Reclamation's					
	actions on the American River, including the Reseville Warren Act Contact, Regionation					
	hac entered into a Programmetic Agreement with SHPO, developed in compliance with					
	Section 106 of the NHPA. This agreement requires Replamation to take mitigative action					
	to protect cultural resources in the event that Shocks Resorveir levels fall below the					
	existing condition minimum elevations posing a potential threat to cultural resources within					
	the receivair. Implementation of recource protection measures would be performed in					
	coordination with SHPO. Flow fluctuations attributable to the Proposed Action/Proposed					
	Project would not occur with enough frequency or magnitude to constitute a significant					
	effect on cultural resources. Therefore, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project would not					
	contribute significantly to increases in the exposure of cultural resources at Shasta					
	Reservoir, and hence, would have no cumulatively considerable contribution to potentially					
	significant impacts on Shasta Reservoir cultural resources that could occur under the					
	cumulative condition. Therefore, cumulative incremental impacts on cultural resources					
	associated with changes in water surface elevations at Shasta Reservoir would be					
	considered less than significant.					
HAPTEN B						
-2	8.1.4 National Historic Preservation Act					
	The Noticeal Historia Presentation Act regulace federal associate to essetide the officer of					
	The National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to consider the affect of their undertakings on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic					
	Preservation an opportunity to comment. The Mational Historic Preservation Act requires					
	the federal government to list significant historic recourses in the Notional Register of					
	Historia Places. Federal agencies must consult the National Register when planning to					
	undertake or grant approval for a project. Prior to issuing any license or implementing a					
	project, the federal agency shall consider the effects of the project or license on any					
	historical buildings, sites, structures, or objects that are included in, or eligible for inclusio					
	in, the National Register (16 U.S.C. § 470, f). The evaluations of cultural resources as pa					
	of this EA/IS document comply with the National Historic Preservation Act as it applies to					

Table 2-1. Text revisions to the Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study.					
Page No. Updeted Text					
	the Proposed Action/Proposed Project and alternatives. Relevant and available documentation for the Area of Potential Affect (APE) are summarized in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources. Reclamation has coordinated with SHPO staff to discuss the scope of the project APE, the impact determinations made, and the level of miligation appropriate for recommendation. Communications with Reclamation indicate that no archaeological sites within Folsom Reconveir have been declared eligible, or licted in the Register (Reclamation and SAFCA 1994a).				

Chapter 3 Public Review Comments and Responses

This chapter includes all public and agency comment letters received on the Draft EA/IS, and the associated responses to comments. The following agencies provided comment letters on the Draft EA/IS:

- 1. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- California Department of Parks and Recreation.
- California State Clearinghouse

The comment letters have been reproduced in the original form in which they were received. Within each numbered letter, specific comments have been alphabetically designated, resulting in an alpha-numeric designator that corresponds to each response (e.g., "2B" refers to the second comment within letter number 2). The responses have been prepared under the direction of Reclamation and the City as lead agencies under NEPA and CEQA, respectively.

The focus of the responses to comments is on the disposition of significant environmental issues, as specified in NEPA and CEQA. The responses to comments provide additional detail regarding the Proposed Action/Proposed Project and clarify technical impact discussions. The additional information does not alter the impact conclusions presented in the Draft EA/IS. Although no revisions or corrections to the text of the EA/IS were identified in response to comments received on the Draft EA/IS, some text revisions were incorporated to acknowledge items inadvertently omitted from a particular section of the document, provide additional clarification regarding Proposed Action/Proposed Project elements and/or analyses, incorporate additional details regarding Proposed Action/Proposed Project features or mitigation measures, and correct other minor errors found during public review and preparation of the Final EA/IS. These text revisions are further described in Chapter 2.



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY U.S. ARMY INQUIRER OUTSICT, EXCHANGETO CORPS OF INCOMES. 1325 J STREET AACHAMISTO, CALIFORNIA PRE14-2912 FORTUREY 9, 2006

Regulatory Branch (200600106)

Derrick Whitehead City of Roseville 311 Vernon Street Roseville, California 95678

Dogr Mr. Whitchead:

We are responding to your lamany 30, 2006 request for comments on the City Of Roseville-Water Supply Intaks project. This project is located non Roseville, in Piscor County, California. Your identification number is 200600106.

The Corps of Engineers' jurisdiction within the study area is under the sutherity of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. Waters of the United States include, but are not limited to, rivers, personnal or intermitment streams, lakes, pends, wetlands, vernal pools, mershes, wet meadows, and seeps. Project features that result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States will require Department of the Army authorization prior to starting work.

To accordain the extent of waters on the project site, the applicant should proper a wetland delineation, in accordance with the "Minimum Standards for Acceptance of Preliminary Wetland Delineations", under "Jurisdiction" on our website at the address below, and submit it to this office for varification. A list of consultants that propers wetland deliceations and permit application documents is also evailable on our website at the same location.

The range of alternatives considered for this project should include alternatives that avoid impacts to wetlands or other waters of the United States. Every effect should be made to avoid project features which require the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. In the event it can be clearly demonstrated there are no practicable alternatives to filling waters of the United States, integration place should be developed to compensate for the anavoidable losses resulting from project implementation.

Please refer to identification number 200600106 in any correspondence concerning this project. If you have any questions, please contact Andrea Jones at our Sacramento Valley Office, 1325 J Street, Room 1480, Sacramento, California 95814-2922, email Andrea J.Jones Quescon. army. mil. or telephone 916-557-7745. You may also use our website: www.sph.usocs.army.mil/regulatory.html.

1A Com

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Thomas J. Cavenaugh Chief, Sacramento Valley Office

Copy ferniehed:

Slizaboth Ayres, Bureau of Reclamation, 7794 Polsom Dam Road, Folsom, California, 95630-1799

Response 1A

The Proposed Action/Proposed Project evaluated within the City of Roseville Long-term. Warren Act Contract EA/FONSI-IS/ND consists of Reclamation entering into a long-term. (25-year) Warren Act contract with the City to convey up to 30,000 AFA of non-Project water (i.e., water not part of the CVP) through the federal facilities at Folsom Dam (e.g., Folsom Pumping Plant) for ultimate delivery to the City's service area. The facilities necessary to physically wheel this water through the Folsom Pumping Plant are existing and no new construction would be required to implement the wheeling agreement. As such, no Clean Water Act Section 404 permit is expected to be required to implement the Warren Act contract. If, for some unforeseen reason, existing project features require replacement or redesign that could result in impacts to waters of the U.S., the project would follow the process outlined in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps). February 9, 2006 comment letter and obtain any necessary Corps permit authorizations. The City's service area is represented by the corporate boundary and includes several. specific plan areas, including the recently annexed West Roseville Specific Plan area. Potential Clean Water Act Section 404 issues related to wetland fills within the City's water service area are discussed below.

Biological opinions addressing the West Roseville Specific Plan area, as well as the Olympus Oaks, Highland Reserve North, Diamond Creek/Eskaton, Mourier 140, Woodcreek North, and Woodcreek West projects, have been issued in support of Clean Water Act Section 404 permits obtained for project activities. The loss of vernal pool habitat has been addressed and mitigated through the Section 7 ESA process during acquisition of Section 404 permits. Through the issuance of biological opinions, mitigation acreages have been required for project impacts to vernal pools. For a summary of anticipated potential vernal pool habitat loss and mitigation acreages, both preserved and created and/or restored, as required by the Section 404 permits for these projects, please refer to Chapter 5, Section 5.4,1,3 of the Draft EA/FONSI-IS/ND.



Amold Schwarzenegger, Governor

Ruth Coleman, Director

DEPARTMENT OF PAÍOCS AND RECRÉATION

Gold Fields District 7505 Folsom Aubum Road Folsom, CA 95630

February 27, 2008

Michael Finnegan, Area Manager U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Central Celifornia Area Office 7794 Folsom Dam Road Folsom, CA 95630

Re: Long-term Warren Act Contract with City of Roseville, SCH #2008012129

This letter is to express the concerns and recommendations of the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) regarding the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Warren Act Contract between the United States Bureau of Reclaration (Reclaration) and the City of Reseville. DPR manages Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (SRA) through an agreement with Reclamation, Folsom Lake SRA attracts approximately 1,5 million visitors annually. Eighty five percent of this use is angaged in water-dependent recreation activities such as boating, swimming, fishing and water skiling. Recreation opportunities, recreation use and the fees DPR generates from visitation are highly dependent upon reservoir levels at Folsom Lake.

Our understanding of this project is that the Warren Act contract would facilitate delivery of up to 30,000 acre feet of water from Folsom Reservoir to the City of Roseville. The City of Roseville is acquiring this water from the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). DPR's primary concern with this project is the cumulative impact of this action, and the many other actions that Reclamation has recently taken or will take in the foresesable future, on reservoir levels and water dependent recreation at Folsom Lake SRA.

The City of Roseville Warren Act Contract EA/MND claims the impacts to recreation at Folsom Reservoir, including cumulative impacts, as a result of this project are less than significant. However, the American River Basin Cumulative Impact Report (2002), which is the basis for the cumulative analysis in the EA/MND, indicates linere will be significant cumulative impacts to both boating and swimming recreation opportunities at Folsom Reservoir (page 3-154) as a result of the foreseeable Rectamation actions within the Basin. Neither the 2002 Cumulative impact Report nor the City of Roseville EA/MND offer any mitigation of these impacts. DPR would like to know how Rectametion intends to address the significant cumulative impacts to recreation at Folsom Reservoir that will result from the lower reservoir levels that will occur from the variety of actions Rectamation has taken and will take in the foreseeable future.

If the City of Roseville fully utilizes the 30,000 scre feet of water proposed in this contract, Reclamation will generate over \$470,000 annually from this conveyance of water. DPR believes Reclamation needs to consider the potential to include in this and

other contracts the proportionale cost of mitigating the impacts to recreation at Folsom Reservoir due to the lower reservoir levels that that will occur incrementally as a result of this contract and the many other actions which will occur in the foreseeable future.

Please see the anciceed Attachment 1 which provides additional details regarding our concerns and recommendations with this project. If you have any further questions regarding this matter, please contact either myself at (918) 988-0205 or the Gold Fields. District Planner Jim Micheele at (918) 988-0613. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Scott Nekeji

Gold Fields District Superintendent

CC Elizabeth Ayres, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Central CA Area Office

Cumulative Impacts on Recreation at Folsom Reservoir

In addition to the 30,000 acre feet of water in this proposal, Reclamation has recently approved diversion of more than 330,000 acre-feet of American River Central Valley. Project (CVP) Water through Long-Term Service Contract renewals. Other near future projects include Warren Act Contracts with the El Dorado Infoation District (an additional 17,000 acre-(eet) and Secremento Suburban Weter District (29,000 acre (eet)) to withdraw additional water from Folsom Reservoir. These and many other reasonably foreseeable actions within the American River Division of the CVP are identified in the American River Besin Cumulative Impact Report (2002). This Report (page 3-154). concludes that the cumulative impacts of the various actions (which divert water out of the American River basin) to both boating and swimming opportunities at Folsom. Reservoir are significant. However, the 2002 Report offers no mitigation or actions to address these significant impacts. One reasonable approach might be to apportion the mitigation for the cumulative impacts to recreation to all of the reasonably foreseeable projects identified in the 2002 Report which contribute to the cumulative significant impect on recreation at Folsom Reservoir. The EA/MIND for the City of Roseville Warren Act Contract concludes that the cumulative impacts to swimming and boating opportunities at Folsom Reservoir are less than significant and proposes no mrigation. or actions to address the impacts from lower reservoir levels to which this project will contribute.

It appears that Rectamation concludes (in the 2002 Currulative Impact Report) that cumulatively there will be significant impacts to recreation at Folsom Reservoir as a result of the vertety of water contracts and actions Rectamation will undertake in the foreseeable future. However, the impacts to recreation at Folsom Reservoir are characterized as less than significant in individual actions, such as this City of Roseville Warren Act Contract. DPR would like to know how Rectamation intends to mitigate the significant impacts to recreation at Folsom Reservoir which are identified in the 2002 Cumulative impact Report, DPR does not believe it is the intent of CEQA or NEPA regulations to parse out cumulative impacts in order to evoid mitigation.

Methods and Information Used to Assass Recreation Impacts at Folsom Reservoir

DPR believes the information upon which recreation impacts are assessed in both the City of Roseville Warren Act Contract EA/MND and the 2002 Cumulative Impact Report does not accurately capture the extent to which recreation boating facilities and boating opportunities are affected by low reservoir levels. For instance, the 2002 Cumulative Impact Report, which is the basis for the cumulative Impact analysis for the City of Roseville Warren Act Contract EA/MND, indicates that boat ramps are inoperable at Grantie Bay below 360 feet elevation (page 3-148). Grantie Bay is the largest and most heavily used boat launching facility at Folsom Lake. A variety of ramps provide launching capability and access at a variety of reservoir levels. At 395' elevation only a small low water ramp and dock provide boat launch access and the vest majority of boat ramps and access at Grantie Bay are inoperable or severely diminished. The ramp, access roads and adjacent parking at this low water ramp do not provide comparable boating access conditions to the primary boat ramps (Stages 1-4) at Grantie Bay. To characterize Grantie Bay es providing access at elevations as low as 380' does not

accurately capture the extent to which recreation opportunities are really impacted at lower reservoir levels.

20 (Cant

Further, the 2002 Cumplative Impact Report Identifies Beal's Point as providing boes ramp availability at slevations above 420' slevation. DPR does not consider Beal's Point as a formal boat ramp or access point. Informal boat launching occurs here at reservoir elevations above 425', however DPR does not provide any docks or other launching facilities as we do at our formal boat launch facilities. DPR closes the access gate at this informal boat launch atte at Beal's Point at elevations below 425' to prevent Begal off-road vehicle use and other problems that occur along the shoreline at low reservoir levels. See the table below for a more accurate depiction of the boat launching (actilities and useable reservoir elevation ranges for each location.

Boat Ramp Facilities and Useable Reservoir Elevation Range

Яа тр	Location	# of	Parking	Mir. Lake	Max. Lake
		Lanes	Speces*	Elevation	Elevation
Rattlesneke Bar	Rattiesnake Bar	2	90	425'	488'
Peninsula Campground	Peninsulà	í	50	410"	466'
Bigger's Cove	Peninsula	í	60	434"	487*
Folsom Lake Marina Main	Browns Ravine	4	400	395*	485
Hobie Cove	Browns Ravine	3	190	375	426
Folsom Point	Folsom Point	4	125	405	468"
New Steps 4	Granite Bay	4	390	425'	456
Old Stage 4	Granite Bay	4	-	450*	466'
Stage 3	Granite Bay	10	300	435'	4501
Stage 2	Grenite Bay	10	250	426	435
Stage 1	Granita Bay	2	100	386	420
5%	Granite Bay	4	80	408*	466'
Low Weter	Grenite Bay	2	25	360'	4107
Totals	13	57	2,070		j

[&]quot;includes both vehicle only and vehicle-traffer spaces, some lots are grave."

Lastly, both the City of Roseville Warren Contract EA/MND and the 2002 Cumulative Study report only consider the impacts of low reservoir levels for the months of March through September. While these documents are correct that the resjority of recreation use occurs in these months, boating recreation use occurs on Folsom Reservoir throughout the year. No quantitative information is provided to indicate how much recreation use occurs in March-September versus the months of October through February. In order to assess the cumulative impacts of the City of Roseville Warren Ad Contract and the many other actions which will affect reservoir levels, DPR believes that the impacts to reservoir levels year-round should be considered.

20

25

Mitigation and Funding for Recruation Impacts at Folsom Reservoir

DPR believes that the significant cumulative impacts to recreation at Foliam Reservoir which are identified in the 2002 Cumulative impact Report, need to be mitigated by Reclamation and the many project partners, including the City of Reserville, that benefit from the water diverted from Folsom Reservoir. The City of Reserville Warren Act Contract action will contribute to lower reservoir levels which will in turn adversely impact recreation opportunities within Folsom Lake SRA. DPR would like to know how Reclamation intends to mitigate the significant impacts to recreation at Folsom Reservoir which are identified in the 2002 Cumulative Study Report which is the basis for the cumulative impacts analysis in the City of Reservice EA/MND.

Reclamation will charge the City of Roseville \$15.71 per sore foot for conveying water to the City of Roseville through the Warren Act Contract. If Roseville fully utilizes the 30,000 acre feet of water, Reclamation would generate over \$470,000 annually for delivering this water. In the CVP American River Diversion Long Term Service Contract DEIS Reclamation identifies costs to the various contractors between \$20 and \$70 per acre foot of water. These contracts have the potential to convey more than 330,000 acre feet of water ennually. DPR believes that Reclamation needs to consider including the cost of mitigating impacts to recreation at Folsom Lake SRA when developing contracts for water at Folsom Reservoir, including the proposed Warren Act Contract with the City of Roseville.

DPR and Reclamation are embarking on renewing our long-term agreement for the management of Folsom Lake SRA. Both agencies know that funding the management of Folsom Lake SRA will be a primary issue to be addressed in the new agreement. OPR believes that providing for and managing recreation use at Folsom Lake SRA is part of the cost of operating Folsom Dam/Reservoir which provides food control, water supply and power. DPR believes that Reclamation should consider whether it is appropriate for the beneficiaries of these amenities, such as the City of Reservice, to help pay for the cost of providing for recreation at Folsom Lake SRA and to mitigate the impacts to recreation resulting from and commensurate to their use of reservoir water.

Response 2A

Please refer to Response 2B.

Response 2B- Cumulative Impacts on Recreation at Folsom Reservoir

The Cumulative Report was prepared to serve as an integral component of NEPA, CEQA, and ESA compliance documentation for the Reclamation CVP American River diversion actions identified as reasonably foreseeable. The Cumulative Report was prepared to supplement the analysis provided in the NEPA, CEQA, and ESA environmental documentation prepared for Reclamation's identified reasonably foreseeable actions within the American River basin. The Cumulative Report was included as an appendix to the PCWA American River Pump Station Project Draft EIS/EIR, dated August 2001. The evaluation within the Cumulative Report includes an assessment of the diversion-related and service area impacts of past and future water diversions and CVP facility operations affecting the water and land-based resources of the American River watershed. The actions included in the Cumulative Report evaluation include CVP water service contracts (new, amended, and renewal contracts), Warren Act contracts, Folsom Dam reoperation for flood control, and Water Forum¹dry year actions.

Under both NEPA and CEQA regulations, mitigation measures are required to minimize significant adverse impacts. According to Reclamation's NEPA Handbook, mitigation under NEPA should be included in the alternatives discussion as environmental commitments to the extent practical (Reclamation NEPA Handbook 2000, pg 6-8). This applies to project specific analyses, however, and NEPA does not have any mitigation requirements associated with significant cumulative impacts (Reclamation NEPA Handbook 2000, pgs 8-18 and 8-19). CEQA requires that feasible mitigation measures be described to minimize adverse project specific impacts (Title 14 CCR § 15126.4). For cumulative impacts under CEQA, mitigation measures shall be described if these measures render the impact less than cumulatively considerable (Title 14 CCR § 15064 (h)(2)).

The City of Roseville Long-term Warren Act Contract EA/FONSI-IS/ND provided a summary of the conclusions of the future cumulative analysis that was included in the Cumulative Report, and included an evaluation of the potential for the Proposed Action/Proposed Project to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the potentially significant cumulative impacts identified in the Cumulative Report. The Cumulative Report identified potentially significant impacts to boating and swimming recreation opportunities at Folsom Reservoir, however, the analysis contained within the City of Roseville Long-term Warren Act Contract EA/FONSI-IS/ND, determined that the Proposed Action/Proposed Project would have no cumulatively considerable

The Sacramento Area Water Forum (Water Forum) is a diverse group of business and agricultural leaders, clearer groups, water managers and local governments in Sacramento, Placel, and El Dorado counties formed to evaluate water resources and future water supply needs of the Sacramento metropolitan region. The Water Forum Agreement includes provisions for each of the participating agencies to achieve the plan's two co-equal objectives: (1) provide a reliable and safe water supply for the region's aconomic health and planned development to 2030; and (2) preserve the fishery, widths, recreational, and aesthetic values of the lower American River.

incremental contribution to the potentially significant Folsom Reservoir boating and swimming impacts that could occur under the cumulative condition (Page 7-17 of the Draft EA/FONSI-IS/ND, January 2006). Therefore, cumulative incremental impacts of the Roseville Warren Act Contract on recreational resources associated with Folsom Reservoir boating and swimming would be considered less than significant and no mitigation is required. As part of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project, the City, via its Water Forum Purveyor Specific Agreement, contributes to the mitigation of cumulative impacts identified in the Cumulative Report as discussed below.

The Cumulative Report identified significant cumulative impacts to boating and swimming opportunities at Folsom Reservoir from the anticipated future water diversions and CVP facility operations, including those actions anticipated under the Water Forum Agreement. The mitigation for these future cumulative impacts to recreation opportunities at Folsom Reservoir will be accomplished through the Water Forum Agreement and financial contribution to the Folsom Reservoir Recreation Program. The Cumulative Report also identified significant cumulative impacts to water-dependent (i.e., boating and fishing opportunities) and water-enhanced (i.e., picnicking) recreation use on the lower American River. The mitigation for these future cumulative impacts to recreation opportunities on the lower American River will be accomplished through the Water Forum Agreement and financial contribution to the HME (please refer to Chapter 1 in the Draft EA/FONSI-IS/ND, for additional description of the HME). The Proposed Action/Proposed Project includes the City's participation in the Water Forum Agreement and financial contribution to the Lower American River HME and the Folsom Reservoir Recreation Program.

As part of their Purveyor Specific Agreements to the Water Forum, the signatories, including, but not limited to, the City of Roseville, PCWA, San Juan Water District, and the City of Folsom have agreed to work with their elected officials, CDPR, and other agencies that have an interest in reservoir levels, such as Congress, Reclamation, the California Department of Boating and Waterways, and the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, to obtain at least \$3,000,000 of new funding for improvements to Folsom Reservoir recreation facilities (Water Forum Agreement, 2000). If less than \$3,000,000 of the new funds is not secured by the year 2008, the signatories would provide a lump sum payment of up to \$1,000,000 of the shortfall to CDPR for projects to improve Folsom Reservoir recreation no later than June 30, 2009. This is to provide certainty that funding necessary for Folsom Reservoir recreation mitigation will be secured and some of the proposed projects for mitigation can be implemented by the CDPR (Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Water Forum Proposal, 1999). The Water Forum signatory agencies, including the City, have agreed to enter into a contract that would commit them to sharing the cost of providing this funding. Costs will be apportioned based upon the signatory agencies anticipated share of the 2030 increased diversions of American River water.

Reclamation and the CDPR were not signatories to the April 2000 Water Forum Agreement or the associated Purveyor Specific Agreements. Reclamation has not yet confirmed agreements with purveyors, including the City, for the reductions in diversions from Folsom Reservoir to offset potential impacts to resources at Folsom Reservoir, as described in the Water Forum Agreement. Although the Proposed Action/Proposed

Project includes the City's and Reclamation's participation in acquiring funding for recreational improvements at Folsom Reservoir, as discussed above, NEPA does not have any mitigation requirements associated with significant cumulative impacts (Reclamation NEPA Handbook 2000, pgs 8-18 and 8-19).

The Water Forum signatory agencies are also participating in additional measures to lessen impacts on Folsom Reservoir surface water elevation levels, and therefore, recreation opportunities at Folsom Reservoir, including: Element II (Action to Meet Customer's Needs While Reducing Diversion impacts in Dry Years); Element V (Water Conservation); and Element VI (Groundwater Management). These adopted measures can be expected to offset the impacts of the reduced Folsom Reservoir surface water elevation levels on boating opportunities and the availability of swimming beaches.

Increased populations supported by the increased water supply may create new demand for facilities and resources in Folsom Reservoir, despite the lower water levels from water diversions and use. With appropriate funding, facilities such as boat ramps can be adapted to lower water conditions. Funding for these types of improvements on Reclamation land is dependent upon other funding sources (e.g., possibly revenue from the sale of state fishing licenses) in addition to funding provided under the Water Forum Agreement. In addition, future increases in demand for facilities to accommodate boating and other recreational vehicles could be met at other reservoirs in addition to Folsom Reservoir.

Response 2C – Methods and Information Used to Assess Recreation Impacts at Folsom Reservoir – Granite Bay Boat Ramp

The Cumulative Report includes a description of the reservoir surface water elevations required for each boat ramp at Folsom Reservoir to remain in operation. The analysis for the decrease in the usability of boat ramps at Folsom Reservoir in both the Cumulative Report and the City of Roseville Long-term Warren Act Contract EA/FONSI-IS/ND utilized significance criteria that accounted for the most conservative reservoir surface water elevation that is needed for all boat ramps at Folsom Reservoir to remain in operation (i.e., 420 feet). The analysis indicates that if the reservoir surface water elevation falls below the 420 foot elevation with enough frequency, it could result in a substantial decrease in the availability of all boat ramps at Folsom Reservoir. Therefore, if there were a substantial decrease in the availability of all boat ramps at Folsom Reservoir, the analysis Incorporates the decrease of the availability of the Granite Bay boat ramp at the 395 foot reservoir surface water elevation and the 360 foot reservoir surface water elevation.

Reliable data on actual recreation uses at different take levels are not available for analysis. However, studies of drought impacts found increased swimming and beach use at lower water levels on Sierra streams during droughts in comparison with use during higher water levels in wet years. Levels for other recreation activities responded differently to changed conditions (Ayres, pers. comm. 2006).

<u>Response 2D - Methods and Information Used to Assess Recreation Impacts at</u> Folsom Reservoir – Beale's Point

The comment is noted and no response is necessary.

Response 2E - Methods and Information Used to Assess Recreation Impacts at Folsom Reservoir - Months Utilized in the Analysis

The City of Roseville Long-term Warren Act Contract EA/FONSI-IS/ND incorporated by reference the Cumulative Report, provided a summary of the conclusions of the future cumulative analysis included in the Cumulative Report, and included an evaluation of the potential for the Proposed Action/Proposed Project to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the potentially significant cumulative impacts identified in the Cumulative Report. In order to determine if the Proposed Action/Proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impacts to Folsom Reservoir boating and swimming opportunities identified in the Cumulative Report, the City of Roseville Long-term Warren Act Contract EA/FONSI-IS/ND included a comparison of the surface water elevations at Folsom Reservoir under Future Cumulative conditions versus the surface water elevations under the Future No. Action/No Project conditions (please refer to Appendix I in the Draft EA/FONSI-IS/ND.) for additional description of these scenarios). In accordance with CEOA requirements (Title 14 CCR § 15130(a)), if a significant future cumulative impact was identified, an additional analysis was performed to determine if the contribution of the Proposed Action/Proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable to the overall cumulative. impact. The Future Cumulative condition is identical to the Future Cumulative condition. utilized in the Cumulative Report to determine the potentially significant cumulative impacts. The Cumulative Report utilized the months of March through September for the analysis of Cumulative impacts to recreation opportunities at Folsom Reservoir. because this is the primary recreation use season, which coincides with the warmer. spring and summer months and relatively high reservoir surface water temperatures.

The following is an analysis of potential cumulative impacts to Folsom Reservoir boating and swimming opportunities under the Proposed Action/Proposed Project, and the Proposed Action/Proposed Project's cumulative contribution to the identified impact during the months of October through February.

Effects on Folsom Reservoir Boating (October through February)

During the months of October through February, Folsom Reservoir levels would fall below the elevations required for use of all boat ramps and marina wet slips more frequently under the cumulative condition than under the existing condition (i.e., below 420 ft in 263 months under the cumulative condition, compared to 231 months under the existing condition, and below 412 ft in 223 months under the cumulative condition, compared to 181 months under the existing condition). The Proposed Action/Proposed Project would result in two months in which Folsom Reservoir elevation would be below the elevation required for use of all boat ramps (420 feet msl) during the October through February period. Folsom Reservoir elevations would fall below 412 feet msl required for the usability of marina wet slips in six additional months during the October

through February period. The reductions in the usability of boat ramps, attributable to the Proposed Action/Proposed Project, do not occur with enough frequency to constitute a significant impact on recreation use at Folsom Reservoir. Moreover, the reductions in usability of boat ramps attributable to the Proposed Action/Proposed Project occur outside of the primary recreation use season. Consequently, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project would have no cumulatively considerable contribution to the potentially significant Folsom Reservoir boating impacts that could occur under the cumulative condition. Therefore, cumulative incremental impacts on recreational resources associated with Folsom Reservoir boating would be considered less than significant.

Effects on Folsom Reservoir Swimming (October through February)

During the months of October through February, the frequency in which Folsom Reservoir water levels would be within the usable (i.e., 420 to 455 feet) range would be substantially reduced under the cumulative condition, relative to the existing condition. (i.e., within the usable beach range in 84 months, relative to 119 months under the existing condition). Under both the cumulative and the existing conditions, there would be no months during the October through February period in which Folsom Reservoir. levels would be within the optimum range (i.e., 435 to 455 feet). The Proposed Action/Proposed Project would result in two less months in which Folsom Reservoir elevations would be within the usable surface elevation ranges required for swimming. activities at Folsom Reservoir during the October through February period. There would be no change in the months in which Folsom Reservoir elevations would be within optimum elevation ranges. The decreases in months for swimming opportunities at Folsom Reservoir attributable to the Proposed Action/Proposed Project do not occur. with enough frequency to constitute a significant impact on Folsom Reservoir. swimming. Moreover, the reductions in the swimming opportunities attributable to the Proposed Action/Proposed Project occur outside of the primary recreation use season. Therefore, the Proposed Action/Proposed Project would have no cumulatively considerable contribution to potentially significant Folsom Reservoir swimming impacts. that could occur under the future cumulative condition. Therefore, cumulative incremental impacts on recreational resources associated with Folsom Reservoir. swimming would be considered less than significant.

<u>Response 2F – Mitigation and Funding for Recreation Impacts at Folsom</u> <u>Reservoir</u>

Please refer to Response 28.





STATE OF CALIFORNIA Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Base Walsh Danster

February 28, 2006

RECEIVED BY MAR 8 6 2006 CITY MANAGER

Mark Morse City of Reseville 311 Verson Street Reseville, CA 95672

Subject: Long-Torm Wester Act Agreement

SCH#: 2006012129

Dear Mark Mone:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to relocated state agencies for covery. The review puriod closed on February 27, 2006, and no utile agencies submitted communic by that doe: This feter ecknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for deaft newtronometal documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the servicemental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the mo-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

بالمسمنة

Terry Roberts

Director, State Clearinghouse

Document Details Report State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2004012129

Project Title Long-Term Warrie Act Agreement

Lend Agency Rose/Re, City of

Type Neg Negative Declaration

Description The U.S. Sureau of Rectamation proposes to water into a long-term (25-year) Warren Act Contract with the City of Receiville to tectifiate delivery of up to \$0,000 some-final arresalty of Placer County Water Agency's water rights water from Folsom Reservoir, Evough the Rederet Implifies at Folsom Dem. to the City's Water Treatment Plant for offereds use in the City service area.

> The proposed action time includes the area in which the water would be delivered and allimetally used, including Foleron Reservoir, specifically the urban water supply intake incessed within Foleron Dank the Follow Pumping Plant and Health Fork Pipuline, and the City of Records Water Treatment Plant. The action area also includes those weterbodies potentially affected by Rachimetion's operation of Central Valley Project (CVP) imilities and Department of Water Resources (CWR) operation of the SWP in response to water deliveries related to the proposed diversion. These later proce include the CVP. number the Secrements River and its upprimers reservoirs, and the lower American River including Fotrom Receiver, as well at Ontylile Receiver, the lower Feether River, and the Dalla.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Mark Norse Cay of Recentles

(918) 774-5334

Address 311 Vernon Street

State CA Zip 96578 City Reserves

Project Location

County Pacer City Research

Angion Cross Streets

Percel No.

Auren 7E Lee Tournal Lie 10N Section 14

Proximity to:

Highways 1400 and 5R-60

Altroca

Andreys (SPAR)

When were Dry Creek and extraples

Schools Various

Lend Use Project not also-specific.

Project Issues Asstratof/Saust; Agrizational Larrid: Air Quality: Archaeologic Heloric; Quantitative Effects;

Overage/Atmosphies; Flood Plain/Flooding: Geologic/Selectic; Growth Industry; Landune; Minerals; Notes: Population/Homing Betwee; Public Services: Recreation/Parts: Sever Capacity; Soil Eroston/Companion/Grading: Solid Water, Toxic/Hetardous: Treffo/Circulation; Vapatellon; Water

Qualty: Water Supply: Waters/Figurier: Withite

Reviewing - Resources Agency: Registed Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Secrements): Department of Parks Agenties and Recreation: Netwo American Heritage Commission: Department of Medith Services: Office of Mintoric Preservation: Department of Fish and Game, Region 2; Department of Winter Resources; California Highway Pretral; California, District S; Department of Tordo Substances Control; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality

Note: Ellenks in date fields result from smulticlars information provided by feed egency.

Document Details Report State Clearinghouse Data Base

Date Received GV27/2006 Start of Anniew GV27/2006 End of Review G2/27/2006

Mote: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by text agentsy.

Response 3

The letter indicates that the proposed City of Roseville Long-term Warren Act Contract EA/FONSI-IS/ND complied with the state clearinghouse review requirements for environmental documents.

The comment is noted and no response is required.

Chapter 4 References

- Ayres, E. Natural Resource Specialist, Central California Area Office, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. Email communication to Patti Idlof, Senior Environmental Planner, HDRJSWRI regarding Roseville Long-term Warren Act EA/IS Draft Response to Comments, March 21, 2006
- Beamesderfer, R., M. Simpson, G. Kopp, J. Inman, A. Fuller and D. Demko. 2004. Historical and Current Information on Green Sturgeon Occurrence in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and Tributaries. S.P. Cramer and Associates, Inc. 46 p.
- CALFED. 2000. Final Programmatic EIS/EIR for CALFED Bay-Delta Program.
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 1998. Fishery Restoration Project Proposal Evaluation for the Secret Ravine Salmon and Steelhead Spawning Habitat Restoration Project.
- CDFG. 2002. California Department of Fish and Game comments to the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding green sturgeon listing.
- City of Roseville General Plan. 1992. City of Roseville Planning Department.
- City of Roseville. 2003. West Roseville Specific Plan and Sphere of Influence Amendment Area Draft Environmental Impact Report. September 15, 2003.
- City of Roseville. 2004. West Roseville Specific Plan and Sphere of Influence Amendment Area Final Environmental Impact Report. January 9, 2004.
- EDAW, Inc. and SWRI. 1999. Water Forum Proposal. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Water Forum Proposal.
- Moyte, P. B. 2002. Inland Fishes of California. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 1999. Essential Fish Habitat Consultation. Guidance. Office of Habitat Conservation.
- NMFS. 2002. Endangered and Threatened Species; Final Rule Governing Take of Four Threatened Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESus) of West Coast Salmonids, 67 FR 1116.
- NMFS. 2002a. Biological Opinion on Interim Operations of the CVP and SWP Between April 2002 and March 2004 on Federally Listed Threatened Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon and Threatened Central Valley Steelhead in Accordance With Section 7 of the ESA.

- NMFS. 2003. Preliminary Conclusions Regarding the Updated Status of Listed ESUs of West Coast Salmon and Steelhead. Draft Report February 2003. West Coast Salmon Biological Review Team. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service-Northwest Fisheries Science Center.
- NMFS. 2004. Biological Opinion on the Long-Term CVP and SWP Operations Criteria and Plan. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, October 2004.
- Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) and Reclamation. 2002. American River Pumps Station Project Final EIS/EIR.
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). 2000. National Environmental Policy Handbook, Public Review Draft. May 2000.
- Reclamation. 2001. American River Basin Cumulative Impact Draft Report. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.
- Reclamation. 2002. American River Basin Cumulative Impact Report. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.
- Reclamation and the City of Roseville. 2006. Long-term Warren Act Contract Draft Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact Initial Study/Negative Declaration. January 2006.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1987. The Needs of Chinook Salmon, Oncorhynchus Tshawytscha, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary- Exhibit 31.
- Water Forum. 1999. Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Water Forum Proposal.
- Water Forum. 2000. Water Forum Agreement. Developed by Stakeholder Representatives for Adoption by Their Governing Boards. January 2000.

Appendix A Final Long-term Warren Act Contract

Appendix B Distribution List for Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

Correany	Nerre	Address	Caty	Same	Zo
Calment Concessor of Con-4 Gares - Record 2		ACCOUNTS NAMED IN THE PARTY OF	Strong Control	CA	440
College Dark of White Property		abid to Book, let Plan		<u> </u>	
Comment Color of the Colored		1400 100- Short, Ballet 121	h	ca.	
College Secretaries Secretaries	***	1816 for Brook Store 1870		<u>م</u>	45414
Co of China Haiffin		D'Come Posso		<u>.</u>	80414 80801-14677
Ou of famous	The sections	to report	(Approximately	<u>.</u>	45400
- 		HI File Breet			_
City of Unants			Liverin .	CA.	644
Ch	Remay Comptol	144 FW Press.	1	C.A.	
Chy of 4 miles	Titley Plant Black		Person	94	45,12-5150
marks (more)		1234 Mills O-1-		e.	T-T-
- Livery		723 Topie Medi	Bana and	CA.	4475
hammal Marrie Parteres Survey		- (-u 1 40%		CA.	MH DO
Place Courty	-	11814 T' A-1514	***	C *	40403
Recer Cessity APCD		11 1111 (-	C4	49643
Party Charles Barrier Charles	Party letters	172 Personalin Avenuer	-	Ç	7366 3
Place Comp. Plant Cornel & Yorks Corner rate: Cortal	Other Randon	1144 4		CA.	77.00
Place County town Agency	directions:	* 0 Mar 45.4		CA .	***
Politic Ullimo Carrodonio		JOF Steel Print	Programme and the second	G#	1667
Paris Liffers Correction	Carrie Darrie	70° 044 3**** P4**	Bear de	CA	AF 1
Adds Villes Commisser	ستنسيني جونبين	-	Personal	CA	247
Ann whee Commen	Chapter E Commercia	300 Baled Server Plant		Ċ4	PP1
Add Villes Commission	-	Mary Park	Process Co.	G.	2404
State State of State	Barry Laws	1625 February Prof	Green Ber	Ç4.	10 F44
v 4 Arry Gara of Organics		ricia i decem		C *	14-760
		2004 Calleys Tree 404 2000		Ċ4.	100
alabar Andrea ardina C arrardi y	Access 10 mars	-	-	DA.	No Park
		MACO Coolinger Stay, 1879-1489	Terreto	Ç	PM-39-1 PM-
leren el finàmetr		MAN CARRY THE ME AND AND	******	CAL .	14E-7-1144
Increments Substant White Dates	Section Section	Propriessor, Services	*	EA.	20.0
Increase in Peak Library		Lift Word	****	ia	Italia 4
u il hann d'hanner - Cand Callera Clim	P4440-4-4	Fifth Fathers Davis Seed	February	G#	PRESS 1760
	Marie .	MATE Hilliam Closer		¢.	pp he?